



North American Wetlands Conservation Act

United States Standard Grant

2003 Proposal Instructions

Proposal Deadlines = MARCH 7, 2003, and JULY 25, 2003

Office of Management and Budget Information Collection Statement In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501), note the following information. This information collection is authorized by the North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.). The information collection solicited: is necessary to gain a benefit in the form of a grant, as determined by the North American Wetlands Conservation Council and the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission; is necessary to determine the eligibility and relative value of wetland projects; results in an approximate paperwork burden of 400 hours per application; and does not carry a premise of confidentiality. Your response is voluntary. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. This information collection has been approved by OMB and assigned clearance number is 1018-0100. The public is invited to submit comments on the accuracy of the estimated average burden hours for application preparation and to suggest ways in which the burden may be reduced. Comments may be submitted to: Information Collection Clearance Officer, Mail Stop 224 ARLSQ, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240 and/or Desk Officer for Interior Department (1018-0100), Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

INTRODUCTION

This document contains instructions for preparing a North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) Standard Grant proposal. You need to consult other files on the web site for guidance regarding eligibility requirements, proposal due dates, format, costs and the NAWCA schedules and processes: [2003 Eligibility Criteria & Processes](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf>) and [2003 Grant Administration Policies and Assistance Award](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grant.pdf) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grant.pdf>). Proposals will be returned as ineligible if they do not adhere to proposal eligibility and cost criteria given in the preceding files and in these instructions. We recommend you read the information in all of these files BEFORE you write a proposal. These instructions are applicable to Standard Grant proposals submitted in through July 25, 2003.

To aid you in completing a proposal, blank proposal outlines and tables may be downloaded from the following files on the web site.

Note that all changes made in the instructions that follow have been reflected in the download files.

1. [2003 Word Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc>),
2. [2003 Word Perfect Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd>), and
3. [2003 Excel Budget Table](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/ExcelBudgetTable.xls) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/ExcelBudgetTable.xls>). These files do not contain any instructions or examples, so you should use the instructions in this file when you are completing one of the blank proposals.

This document is organized into the following sections. Each section contains examples that are preceded by **EXAMPLE**. Numbers in the examples are not intended to be consistent among sections of the proposal.

1. Introduction
2. Major Changes
3. Project Officer's Page
4. Proposal Summary
5. Proposal Purpose and Scope
6. Proposal Budget and Work Plan (includes Budget Table and Budget Justification)
7. Proposal Technical Assessment Questions
8. Proposal Attachments (Budget Table, Tract Table, Partner Contribution Statements, Optional Matching Contributions Plan, Standard Form 424 and Assurances B and D, Optional Aerial Photographs, and Maps)
9. Proposal Easements, Leases, and Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.

MAJOR CHANGES FROM THE 2002 STANDARD GRANT INSTRUCTIONS

Following are the MAJOR changes from the 2002 instructions. There are other changes than the ones listed here, so please read each section of the instructions carefully. Also see eligibility requirements changes in [2003 Eligibility Criteria & Processes](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf>). Changes made after these instructions are posted on the NAWCA web site will be listed here with the date of change and will also dated in the affected section in the instructions.

Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Landowner agreements do not need to be submitted.• The following material is now an Attachment: Budget Table (if not included in the Budget section), Tract Table, Partner Contribution Statements (replaces partner letters), Standard Form 242 and B and/or D assurances, aerial photographs, maps.
Easements, Leases, and Indirect Cost Rate Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include this material as the last section of the proposal.
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work plan deleted as separate section and merged into Budget.• Budget Table is required and can be part of the proposal budget section or included as an attachment.• Created Wetlands and Indirect Costs are added as budget categories.• Direct project administrative costs and proposal compliance costs are included under the budget category "Other Direct Costs".• Nest boxes, habitat islands, and initial expenses caused by the proposal to manage tracts, such as signing and fencing, are included under the budget category "Enhancement".• Tract and subgrantee information is required.• It is suggested that additional tables may be used to give some budget information.
Council Coordinator's Address	Note the addition of the Attn: and Mail Stop lines. Coordinator, North American Wetlands Conservation Council U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

	Division of Bird Habitat Conservation Attn: Bettina Sparrowe Mail Stop MBSP 4075 4401 North Fairfax Drive Arlington, VA 22203
Created Wetlands	Separate category in Summary, Budget Table, Budget Justification, and Technical Assessment Questions 4 and 5
Due Dates	March 7 and July 25, 2003.
Indirect Costs	Separate cost category in Summary, Budget Table and Budget Justification
Proposal Eligibility Factors, Definitions, and Format	Separated from proposal instructions and combined with eligible cost factors in one file on the web site: 2003 Eligibility Criteria & Processes (http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf)
Instructions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicants encouraged to use appropriately use tables and bulleted lists, instead of full sentences and paragraphs, to provide information Reformatted into questions, rather than declarative statements (e.g., “What grant amount is requested?” instead of “List the grant amount being requested.”). The Word and Word Perfect blank proposal outlines are formatted the same way.
Letters/Partner Contribution Statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters replaced by Partner Contribution Statements (letters are still allowed this year) If any Matching Contributions Plan match used, include the approval letter with the proposal. Do not submit a cover/transmittal letter.
Matching Contributions Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retitled Optional Matching Contributions Plan Moved to attachments section.
Non-Match	Include non-match in all proposal sections, except Technical Assessment Questions 1-7b; i.e., include in Question 7c-d.
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section information/headers: Final Title Holders/Managers and Acreage; Project Description; Habitat Types and Wildlife Benefiting; Public Benefits; and New Partners Very specific instructions are given.
Tract Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tract Table moved to the Attachments section. Budget information deleted from Tract Table. Tract information is required in the Budget section.
Standard Form 424	Moved to the Attachments section.
Technical Assessment Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created Wetlands is added as a separate category in TAQ 4 and 5. Note that non-add acres, benefits from non-add acres, and work on non-add acres should be reported in all sections of the proposal EXCEPT TAQ 4. The narrative of TAQ 5 is revised as follows: Narrative: Provide narrative needed to explain the table information. Also answer the following questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How significant is the proposed work on each tract and the cumulative work in the completed proposal to long-term wetlands conservation in terms of 1) how work on each tract complements work on other tracts; 2) threats to wetlands values (address acquisition of water rights, if applicable); 3) conservation or management of larger wetland areas; and 4) objectives of wetlands conservation plans. What is your justification for modifying existing wetlands from one type to another? Specifically for proposed restoration and enhancement activities, how long will the results last and when will maintenance or additional work be needed? How reliable and successful are any proposed vegetation control techniques? What is the long-term conservation and management plan for the proposal area? What are your plans to any tracts in the proposal? How will the easement restrictions and reserved rights serve to ensure long-term wetland conservation and health?
Work Plan	Merged into the Budget section.

CHANGES FROM 2003/CHANGES MADE SINCE INITIAL POSTING TO WEB SITE

1. See 11 under “What information Justifies the budget?”
2. See Budget Table Example.
3. See Indirect Costs Budget Justification.

2003 PROPOSAL PROJECT OFFICER'S PAGE

Did you include a cover/transmittal letter with the proposal? Please do NOT include a cover/transmittal letter with the proposal. The Project Officer's page should be the first page of the proposal.

What is the proposal title? Enter a short, succinct, descriptive, and unique title, such as "Falcon Bottoms", "Turtle Bog Marsh" or "Great Bay". If a previous proposal with the same title was funded, include the appropriate numeral to denote that this is a subsequent proposal, such as "Falcon Bottoms II". If a title is too long (more than 50 characters, including spaces), we will shorten it.

What are the geographical landmarks for the proposal?

1. State(s):
2. County (ies):
3. Congressional District(s):
4. Central latitude and longitude point:

When did you submit the proposal?

Is an Optional Matching Contributions Plan submitted with the proposal?

What is the status of previous NAWCA-funded proposals you have submitted in the same project area? For example, if the current proposal is Falcon Bottoms III, give the status of Falcon Bottoms I and II.

How many more proposals will you submit for the same project area?

What is the Project Officer information?

1. Name:
2. Title:
3. Organization: The Project Officer must be affiliated with/employed by the Grantee's organization; thus it will be assumed that the organization entered here is the grantee organization. If not, explain.
4. Address:
5. Telephone number:
6. Facsimile machine phone number:
7. Electronic mail address:

Has the Project Officer read eligibility material and grant administration policies available on the NAWCA web site? Provide the following statements: "To ensure that the proposal complies with available guidelines and to ensure that partners are aware of their responsibilities, the Project Officer submits the following statements: I have read the 2003 standard grant instructions, eligibility information, and grant administration policies and informed partners or partners have read the material themselves. To the best of my knowledge, the proposal is eligible and complies with all NAWCA, North American Wetlands Conservation Council, and Federal grant guidelines. The work in this proposal consists of work and costs associated with long-term wetlands and migratory bird habitat conservation."

Do you have any comments about, or suggestions for, the NAWCA program? Provide comments here or send at any time

- In writing to
Coordinator, North American Wetlands Conservation Council
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Division of Bird Habitat Conservation
Mail Stop MBSP 4075
4401 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203
- Via phone to 703-358-1784;
- Via facsimile machine to 703-358-2282;
- Via electronic mail to dbhc@fws.gov.

2003 PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Proposal Summary is the only narrative material provided to the North American Wetlands Conservation Council and Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, so it must be descriptive and succinct. Format instructions for preparing the Proposal Summary follow. Consider developing the Summary after you have written the rest of the proposal, as this will help to ensure that information in the Summary is the same as in the rest of the proposal. Due to the importance of the format for, and information in, the Proposal

Summary, very specific instructions follow. An example is also provided.

General Requirements

1. The Proposal Summary will be used as a stand-alone document. Start the Proposal Summary on a new page; i.e., do not begin the Proposal Summary on the same page as the Project Officer's page.
2. Do not number Proposal Summary pages.
3. The Proposal Summary, which includes tabular and narrative information, **must not exceed two pages**.
4. Margins: The Summary is the only part of the proposal that has specific margin requirements. Left margin should be 1 inch and all other margins should be ½ inch.
5. Font size: 11 point.
6. Font typeface: Times New Roman is preferred.
7. The information in the Summary table must be exactly the same as provided elsewhere in the proposal.

Specific Requirements (see the example below).

1. Center on the page and type in all capital letters: NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT PROPOSAL SUMMARY. Go to the next line.
2. Center and type the title under the header in initial capital letters. Double space.
3. Type in all capital letters: COUNTIE (IES), STATE (S), CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (S): List the county (ies), state (s), and congressional district (s), in which the project occurs. Double space.
4. Using the prescribed format shown in the example, provide the information requested below. However, **do not include** categories shown in the example if no information for that category exists. For instance, if there are no non-matching partners, do not include that heading in the table, or if there is no restoration work being done, do not include a "Restored" line in the "ACTIVITIES, COSTS, AND ACRES" section.
 - Left justify and type in all capital letters: GRANT AMOUNT. Tab over or right justify and enter the grant amount. Double space.
 - Left justify and type in all capital letters: MATCHING PARTNERS. Tab over and enter the total match amount in alignment with the grant amount. On the next line, left justify and type: Grantee: and enter the grantee's name/organization and contribution. If the grantee is not contributing, enter \$0. Continue to list matching partners and contributions under the grantee. List **all** the matching partners, whether they contribute more or less than 10% of the grant request (see Technical Assessment Question 7B). Double space. If a partner's match amount is associated with a Matching Contributions Plan (either a Match Plan submitted with this proposal or a Match Plan already approved by the Council for a previous grant award), **list only the match amount that is being applied to this proposal**, but show the **full acreage associated with the contribution** in parentheses under the appropriate activity category. For example, a partner may have spent \$1 million to acquire 2,000 acres to form the core of your project. In Proposal I you listed the partner and showed them contributing \$500,000 match. The Council approved the Matching Contributions Plan for \$500,000. In Proposal II you showed the partner with the remaining match of \$500,000. See instructions below for handling acreage associated with a Match Plan.
 - Left justify and type in all capital letters: NON-MATCHING PARTNERS. Tab over and enter the total non-match amount in alignment with the total match amount. On the next line, left justify and list all non-matching partners and contributions in the same format as for matching partners. Double space.
 - Left justify and type as follows: ACTIVITIES, COSTS, AND ACRES (parentheses indicate acres accounted for under another category). Tab over and enter the total proposal cost (grant, match, and non-match) and acreage using the prescribed format in the example below under the non-match amount. On the next line, left justify and list appropriate activities, costs, and acreages choosing from the following activity categories: Fee Acquired; Fee Donated; Easement(s) Acquired; Easement(s) Donated; Lease(s) Acquired; Lease(s) Donated; Other Acquisition Costs; Restored; Enhanced; Created Wetlands; Other; and Indirect Costs. List the activities in the order just stated. Do not list categories in which no activity will take place. After each category listed, type a hyphen (-) and indicate the amount being expended, then type a slash (/) and the acreage involved. Double space.
 - i. Enter acquired or donated acreage first. If acquired or donated acreage also will be restored or enhanced, place parentheses around the restored or enhanced acreage amount to show that they have already been accounted for under the acquired or donated categories. For instance, in the example below, a total of 3,500 acres are being acquired in fee and through donation. Because 1,000 of those acres are being restored, that acreage is indicated as "(1,000)" on the "Restored" line. Also shown on the Restored line is 700 acres that are not accounted for in another category.
 - ii. If any acreage is associated with a proposed Matching Contributions Plan submitted with the proposal, show the full acreage in the proposal, but if it is associated with a previously approved Match Plan, show the acreage in parentheses in the proposal. This indicates that the acreage has previously been accounted for.
5. Left justify the rest of the Proposal Summary. Type in all capital letters" FINAL TITLE HOLDERS/MANAGERS AND ACREAGE: List land-title holders, the associated acreage, and the responsible land managers in the prescribed format shown in the example. Double space.

6. Type in all capital letters: PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Describe the proposed project's goals and objectives; why the work is proposed; who will be doing what activity (ies); where they will be doing the activity (ies) (for example, on a refuge, on private land, near a conservation area); how they will accomplish the work (building dikes, installing water-control structures, etc.); what, if any, North American Waterfowl Management Plan joint venture is involved or benefiting. Double space.
7. Type in all capital letters: HABITAT TYPES AND WILDLIFE BENEFITTING: Describe the habitat types involved in the proposed project activities; provide examples of the species (blue-winged teal, American bittern, etc.) benefiting and their uses of the habitats (breeding, feeding, resting, etc.); list endangered species found on the proposed project site(s). Double space.
8. Type in all capital letters: PUBLIC BENEFITS: Describe the benefits of the proposed project to the public (hiking, hunting, birding, education, water quality, etc.). Double space.
9. Type in all capital letters: NEW PARTNERS: Identify the partners who have not participated in a NAWCA grant before. This information concludes the Proposal Summary. Enter a page break.

SUMMARY EXAMPLE

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT PROPOSAL SUMMARY

St. George's Marsh II

COUNTY (IES), STATE (S), CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (S): Wetland County, MN, District 14

GRANT AMOUNT	\$1,000,000
--------------	-------------

MATCHING PARTNERS	\$1, 581,000
-------------------	--------------

Grantee: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources \$700,000
 Ducks Unlimited, Inc. \$500,000
 Bob Jones \$6,000
 County Sportsmen's Club \$10,000
 Doris Smith \$365,000

NON-MATCHING PARTNERS	\$305,000
-----------------------	-----------

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service \$300,000
 Jackson Community College Natural Resource Department \$5,000

ACTIVITIES, COSTS, AND ACRES () = acres also shown in another category	\$2,886,000/4,400 (1,000) acres
--	---------------------------------

Fee Acquired - \$756,000/1,500 acres
 Fee Donated - \$504,000/1,000 acres
 Easements Acquired - \$648,750/750 acres
 Easements Donated - \$216,250/250 acres
 Restored - \$750,000/700 (1,000) acres
 Enhanced - \$6,000/200 acres
 Other \$5,000

FINAL TITLE HOLDERS/MANAGERS AND ACREAGE: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) 1,750 acres; Ducks Unlimited, Inc. (DU) 750 to be co-managed with DNR; private landowner Jones 200; U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) 1,700. In addition to acreage affected by this project, private landowner Smith and the Sportsmen's Club (Club) will retain title to residual fee on 250 and 750 acres, respectively

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This proposal represents phase 2 of a 5-year project to protect and restore 10,000 acres of wetlands and associated uplands to provide habitat for ground-nesting migratory birds. Second home development is expanding in the vicinity of the project at a rapid pace and poses a threat. The project is located in the Minnesota Grand Rapids focus area of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan's Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, helps to meet goals of the St. George's Marsh Partners in Flight Conservation Plan, and meets U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan foraging-habitat objectives.

This project will allow partners to permanently protect a 3,500-acre complex of key migratory bird habitats through several means: fee-title acquisition, donation of fee title to the Service, perpetual conservation easement acquisition, and donation of a perpetual conservation easement to the DNR. Ms. Doris Smith donated property in fee title to DU that is being used as match. Service and DNR contributions and grant funds will be used to complete new acquisitions.

Partners will restore 700 acres of wetlands by building dikes, removing tile drains, breaching dikes, digging wells, and constructing pump stations to ensure water availability during drought periods. The terminus of a ditch, which enters the

northwest corner of the proposal area and delivers considerable flowage to Jackson National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge), will be rerouted to facilitate the placement of one lift-pump station. Local excavation company contractors will do most restoration earthwork and related construction. Another lift-pump station and associated sediment retention ponds will be installed at two locations on tracts to be acquired and held by DNR. The Sportsmen's Club (Club) and DU will conduct restoration work on public and private land, with the Club conducting a fundraising campaign to acquire materials and DU providing personnel. Restoration work has been completed on 1,000 acres that will be acquired through this proposal; the value of this work is being used as match by DNR. Mr. Bob Jones has contributed \$6,000-worth of wood duck nest boxes to enhance wildlife habitat on approximately 200 acres of wetlands on private land adjacent to the Refuge. The Jackson Community College Natural Resource Department will provide \$5,000 to support the Project Officer in grant administration.

HABITAT TYPES AND WILDLIFE BENEFITTING: A variety of habitat types will be acquired and restored: oxbow wetlands (decreasing), shallow emergent wetlands (decreasing), and associated uplands required by migratory birds for feeding, loafing, and nesting. A 1,000-acre fee-title donation to the Service includes the rare "swampbog" community that is also critical habitat for the Federally listed endangered marsh shrew. Approximately 400 acres of nesting habitat will be restored for the northern harrier, a declining species. The proposal area contains breeding habitat for Forster's tern, least bittern, and waterfowl, annually including mallard, blue-winged teal, ruddy duck, canvasback, and Canada goose.

PUBLIC BENEFITS: A resulting benefit of the project to humans and wildlife will be the improved surface and groundwater quality and quantity and the reduction of soil erosion. The proposal area is currently, and will continue to be, open to the public for such uses as birding, hiking, hunting, and research. Public use may be restricted during certain times during the year to protect migratory birds and endangered species.

NEW PARTNERS: The proposal partnership includes some members that are new to the Act's grants program: the two private landowners, the Community College, and the Sportsmen's Club.

2003 PROPOSAL PURPOSE AND SCOPE

What are the proposal objectives, affected habitats, and affected wildlife (especially wetland-associated migratory birds) and wetland functions?

How does the proposed work form a long-term wetlands and migratory bird conservation proposal that should be funded under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA)?

What are the linkages between the proposal and conservation objectives of the following programs/plans and other international migratory bird and wetlands conservation programs/plans: North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Partners in Flight, U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan, and North American Waterbird Conservation Plan? How do proposal activities address specific habitat priorities stated in these conservation plans? If there are no direct linkages to conservation plans, how and why was the proposal developed?

If the proposal is part of a larger multi-phase or landscape level project, how does it fit into the larger effort?

How is the proposal unique from, or complementary to, previously funded proposals?

How did you determine the proposal boundaries?

What are the threats and special circumstances that make NAWCA funding important at this time? Will any partner match be lost if the proposal is not funded?

What are the current public and private uses of lands in the proposal area and are you proposing any changes?

Will you allow public access? Will you limit the number of people permitted access or the season of access?

Has the public been informed about the proposal? Have landowners been contacted? If applicable, what is the willingness of landowners to sell properties?

2003 PROPOSAL BUDGET AND WORK PLAN

Is the required Budget Table submitted here or as an attachment?

1. Complete the Budget Table shown below and insert it as a numbered or unnumbered page in this section of the proposal or as an attachment at the end of the proposal. You may submit additional tables if you believe they will help explain the budget, but keep them to a minimum. Each of the [2003 Word Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc>), and [2003 Word Perfect Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd>) files contain blank Budget Tables or you can use the table in the file [2003 Excel Budget Table](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/ExcelBudgetTable.xls) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/ExcelBudgetTable.xls>).
 2. Use a means to consistently identify each tract (or logical groupings of tracts) on maps and throughout the proposal. Show all costs covered by grant, each matching partner, and each non-matching partner for all tracts.
 3. You may show grant and one partner's contribution on one line for the same tract, but do not combine different partner contributions on the same line. For example, if there are 10 separate partners contributing to fee acquisition for Tract Z, then there should be 10 separate partner entries for Tract Z. Add lines to the budget table as needed. In the example below, a line was added under Land Costs: Fee Acquired for Tract A because partners DNR and PF should not be shown on one line. In the example, a line was added under Land Costs Easement Acquired because different tracts are affected.
 4. Separate match funds into "Old" (spent prior to proposal submission) and "New" (costs yet to occur after proposal is submitted and during the Grant Agreement period).
 5. If you are submitting a Matching Contributions Plan, be sure the Budget Table only includes funds for the current proposal and not the whole contribution by any partner in the Match Plan.
 6. Show each private landowner by name, contribution amount, and tract if they are providing a matching or non-matching contribution.
 7. All cost categories are shown in the example below. Leave blank or delete inappropriate categories (e.g., there is no enhancement in your proposal, so you can leave that section blank or delete it).
 8. You may use a landscape, versus portrait, orientation for the printed page if needed.
 9. You may abbreviate partner names in the Budget Table, but be sure to spell them out somewhere in the Budget section of the proposal.
 10. NA in the example below means "Not Applicable".
- 11.** In the last column of the Budget Table, identify each sub-grantee agency or organization (or abbreviate and spell the name out below the table) that will receive, as a result of this proposal, any of the following. Contractors or vendors who will be paid for goods, construction, planting or services purchased for the project and individuals are NOT considered subrecipients, ~~so the Contracts ell is labeled "NA" (not applicable) in the blank proposal outline files and in the example below. Change made 1/23/03.~~
- o Federal grant funds or "new" matching funds,
 - o Property (e.g., land, structures, dikes, levees, earthen dams, equipment, supplies) that will be purchased with Federal grant or matching funds or
 - o Property committed as "new" match.

BUDGET TABLE EXAMPLE (Changes made 1/23/03)

DIRECT and INDIRECT COST ACTIVITIES	GRANT \$	MATCHING and NONMATCHING PARTNERS				TOTAL \$	TRACT ID	SUB- GRANTEE NAMES
		PARTNER NAME	OLD MATCH \$	NEW MATCH \$	NON- MATCH \$			
Land Costs: Fee Acquired	\$300,000	DNR	\$	\$300,000	\$	\$600,000	A	None
		PF		\$200,000		\$200,000	A	None
Land Costs:Fee Donated	NA		\$	\$	\$	\$		
Land Costs:Easement Acquired	\$500,000		\$	\$	\$	\$500,000	B	FWS
		TNC		\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	Smith	DNR
Land Costs:Easement Donated	NA	LOI	\$250,000	\$	\$	\$250,000	C	NA none
Land Costs:Lease Acquired	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		
Land Costs:Lease Donated	NA		\$	\$	\$	\$		
Appraisals and Other Acquisition Costs	\$	FWS	\$	\$	\$10,000	\$10,000	A	none

DIRECT and INDIRECT COST ACTIVITIES	GRANT \$	MATCHING and NONMATCHING PARTNERS				TOTAL \$	TRACT ID	SUB-GRANTEE NAMES
		PARTNER NAME	OLD MATCH \$	NEW MATCH \$	NON-MATCH \$			
Non-Contract Personnel and Travel	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	NA	
TOTAL ACQUIRED	\$800,000		\$250,000	\$500,000	\$10,000	\$1,560,000	NA	NA
Contracts	\$25,000	LO2	\$10,000	\$	\$	\$35,000	A	NA DU
	\$75,000	DU		\$100,000		\$175,000	C	NA DU
Materials and Equipment	\$	PI	\$	\$300,000	\$	\$300,000	Smith	DNR
Non-Contract Personnel and Travel	\$10,000		\$	\$	\$	\$10,000	NA	FWS
TOTAL RESTORED	\$110,000		\$10,000	\$400,000	\$	\$520,000	NA	NA
Contracts	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	NA	NA
Materials and Equipment	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		
Non-Contract Personnel and Travel	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	NA	
TOTAL ENHANCED	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	NA	NA
TOTAL CREATED WETLANDS	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$		
GRAND TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	\$910,000	NA		\$1,170,000	\$10,000	\$2,080,000	NA	NA
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	\$		\$	\$	\$	\$	NA	
GRAND TOTAL ALL COSTS						\$2,080,000	NA	NA
FUND SOURCES							NA	NA
Grant	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$910,000	NA	NA
State Dept. of Natural Resources	NA	DNR		\$300,000		\$300,000	NA	NA
Pheasants Forever	NA	PF		\$200,000		\$200,000	NA	NA
Landowner 1	NA	LO1	\$250,000			\$250,000	NA	NA
Landowner 2	NA	LO2	\$10,000			\$10,000	NA	NA
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	NA	FWS			\$10,000	\$10,000	NA	NA
Ducks Unlimited	NA	DU		\$100,000		\$100,000	NA	NA
Pump, Inc.	NA	PI		\$300,000		\$300,000	NA	NA
GRAND TOTAL	NA	NA	\$260,000	\$900,000	\$10,000	\$2,080,000	NA	NA

Do you need to explain any abbreviations in the Budget Table?

If your grant request exceeds \$1,000,000, what is your justification?

Has any match been previously approved by the Council via an Optional Matching Contributions Plan? In the current proposal, what tracts are affected, how much of each partner's match has been used in previous proposals, how much is being used in this proposal, and how much will remain after the current proposal is funded?

What information justifies the budget?

1. Explain all costs shown in the Budget Table (grant, match and non-match dollars and non-add acres), including unusually high costs or large differences between per acre value of match and grant tracts. Remember to refer to the [2003 Eligibility](#)

[Criteria & Processes \(http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf\)](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf) file for information on eligible and ineligible direct and indirect costs and negotiated indirect cost rate agreements. Explain if a cost estimate is different from the fair market/reasonable value.

2. As shown below and consistent with the Budget Table, include a Budget Justification section for each activity in the Budget Table and delete any Budget Justification sections that are blank or deleted from the Budget Table. For example, if the proposal does not include any acquisition, then the Budget Table would have that section blank or deleted and the Budget Justification section regarding acquisition should be deleted from the proposal.
3. Type the Budget Justification section titles in all capital letters and enter the total cost and acreage after it. For example, "ACQUISITION BUDGET JUSTIFICATION - \$3,000,000 AND 20,000 acres". On the next line, separately enter the amount of grant, match, and non-match funding.
4. All figures should be the same as in the Budget Table.
5. Very limited information on habitats and species may be included, but only if you have first given the required information.
6. Note that all questions are in the future tense, but they also apply to past (match) work and costs.
7. NA in the tables below means "Not Applicable".
8. Note that examples of how to answer the questions are given below to enable, and encourage, you to provide the requested information in the most efficient manner possible. When appropriate, use tables, bulleted lists, or short statements instead of full sentences and paragraphs to provide the information. When tables are given as examples, that indicates that answers should be presented in columns, however it is not required that a table be developed. For example, information for the first question "When will each fee tract be acquired?" could also be answered by showing information in the following columns:

Tract Month, Year When Fee Acquisition Will Occur.

ACQUISITION BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – \$3,000,000 and 20,000 acres
Grant - \$1,000,000 Match - \$2,000,000 Non-Match - \$0

When will each fee tract be acquired? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Tract	Month, year when fee acquisition will occur

EXAMPLES

- A target acquisition area has been identified through our GIS system that includes important wetland and migratory bird habitat. The 10 tracts and the whole target area are shown on a map in the proposal. Sellers have been contacted and all are currently willing, however if negotiations fall through, other tracts in the target area might be substituted as approved by the Council Coordinator.
- Based on estimated cost from recent sales of comparable properties in the area and evaluations of properties available in the target area, we expect to acquire approximately 750 acres with the \$50,000 grant funds. Acquisitions will be from willing sellers to whom we will make written offers of just compensation based on appraisals approved by a USFWS reviewing appraiser.

When will each fee donation occur and who are the donors and recipients?

Tract	Month, year when fee donation will occur	Donor	Recipient

When will each easement tract be acquired? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Tract	Month, year when easement acquisition will occur

When will each easement donation occur and who are the donors and recipients?

Tract	Month, year when easement donation will occur	Donor	Recipient

For each tract acquired or donated in fee or easement, what is the cost per acre, what method did you use to determine costs, how do you know the costs are reasonable, and explain unusually high costs or large differences between per acre value of match and grant tracts or fee and easement tracts.

EXAMPLES

- Cost estimate is based on prevailing land values as determined by previous acquisitions and anticipated land value increases.
- The estimated value is from the average per-acre value of three comparable sales of island property in the Big River during the past six months.

- John Smith sold a 400-acre tract of primarily forested wetlands to Birds Forever on 9/22/year (which is within two years of the year this proposal is being submitted) for \$200,000. The market value of the property based on appraisal (done within one year of purchase) is \$700,000. Mr. Smith's bargain sale of \$500,000 is the matching contribution.
- Actual cost of acquiring perpetual easements on 530.5 acres of wetlands and riparian buffers on private lands in 13 tracts in Grand and Maverick Counties in years (see "green" tracts on map). Easement value was determined through appraisals.
- Joan Smith donated a perpetual 80-acre conservation easement appraised at \$73,500 (Tract D on the map) to the State DNR. DNR conducted 2 appraisals on the tract in April, 2002. The easement has a higher cost/acre than other tracts in the proposal, due to high development potential of the uplands. A copy of the easement is included with this proposal.

If a tract is donated, how does the donation increase resource values or degree of protection/management of wetlands? There is no need to answer this question if the donation is from a private landowner to a conservation organization.

Will acquisition of any tracts be credited to wetlands mitigation banks or be used to satisfy wetlands mitigation requirements?

For each easement, answer the following questions. Consider using the sample table below for your answers.

1. **What tract is associated with the easement?**
2. **What is the term/length?**
3. **What organization will monitor the easement?**
4. **Who will the easement revert to in the event the primary easement holder ceases to exist?**
5. **Have you adopted the Land Trust Alliance or other easement monitoring standards?**
6. **Do you have a stewardship endowment dedicated to the project area? How much?**
7. **What are the restrictions, allowed structures, allowed activities and reserved rights?**

Tract	Term	Monitoring Organization	Reversionary Organization	Monitoring Standards	Stewardship Endowment
Restrictions: Allowed structures: Allowed activities: Reserved rights:					
Restrictions: Allowed structures: Allowed activities: Reserved rights:					

What work will be done, when, and on what tract(s) through the APPRAISALS and OTHER ACQUISITION COSTS budget (e.g., contract costs, closing costs, surveys, etc.) and how did you determine the costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

EXAMPLES					
Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Appraisals	2	\$2,500/appraisal	\$5,000	1 month after proposal submitted	1
Appraisal	1	\$1,000/appraisal	\$1,000	April, 2002	2
Appraisals	2	\$1,000/appraisal \$1,500/appraisal	\$2,500	February, 2003	Jones
Surveys and closing costs		NA	\$10,000	June, 2002	1
Surveys and closing costs		NA	\$2,500	October, 2002	2
Surveys and closing costs		NA		July, 2002	Jones
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$21,000	NA	NA

- The appraisal for tract 3 (700 acres) was done according to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice. We obtained three informal quotations from three appraisers and our estimated cost represents the average of the three. The estimated cost is relatively high because of the appraiser's need to obtain the services of a professional forester to place a value on the 100 acres of merchantable saw timber on the tract.
- The appraisals were done according to federal standards. The cost may seem high, but can be explained by several factors. Although we approached two appraisers to compare costs, there are few appraisers familiar with the complex real estate issues characteristic of the region. We chose the most reasonable appraiser for the job. Also the large tract involves multiple landowners and thus reviews of multiple deeds and ownership histories.

How do you know the costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the APPRAISALS and OTHER ACQUISITION COSTS budget?

EXAMPLES

- 2 appraisals will be conducted on Tracts 1 (1,500 acres) and 2 (1,000 acres) according to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
- Having consulted with 3 appraisers, we are confident the appraisal rate is standard and reasonable for the area.

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL and TRAVEL budget and how did you determine the costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

EXAMPLE

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Salary of biologists to conduct required state-required environmental survey	2	\$10,000/yr	\$20,000	January, 2002	1, 2
Travel to sites for environmental surveys	3	\$500/trip	\$1,500	NA	Jones
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$21,500	NA	NA

How do you know the costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL and TRAVEL budget?

RESTORATION BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – \$2,000,000 and 10,000 acres
Grant - \$1,000,000 Match - \$1,000,000 Non-Match - \$0

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the CONTRACTS budget and how did you determine costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

EXAMPLE

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Backhoe time to install 14 riser and flap gates	755 hours	\$75/hour	\$56,625	August, 2003	1-14
Buy and install concrete risers and poly pipe	3	\$1,000/item	\$3,000	July, 2003	1, 2, Jones
Refurbish lift pumps	3	\$14,000/pump	\$42,000	Sept., 2003	1, 2, Jones
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$101,625	NA	NA

How do you know the costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the CONTRACTS budget?

EXAMPLES

Grant and S DNR funds will be pooled to pay for the contract to restore 1,920 acres of Tract 2. Earthwork and related construction will be by contract with local excavation companies. We estimated the cost of the contract by getting three informal quotes from local contractors and multiplying the average of the three quotes times 1.035. The factor of 1.035 is based on the predicted increase in the consumer price index (c.p.i.) by the time that the contract will be awarded.

Dike construction = \$100,000

Dike seeding and mulching = \$18,000

Water control structure construction (wood and concrete) = \$26,000

Tile drains removal and dike breaching = \$6,000

Well drilling and pump installation = \$94,000

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget, what will be purchased, and how did you determine costs? For plantings of seeds or seedlings are to be planted, what seed or plant species will be planted and what percentage of each species is in the total planting?

EXAMPLES

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Pump	1	\$12,000/pump	\$12,000	Oct, 2003	1
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$12,000	NA	NA

- Materials and equipment costs are to restore 220 acres of rice fields, currently in production, to seasonal and semi-permanent

wetlands. Spoils material from swale excavation will be used to build new levees, islands within the pools and to de-level pond bottoms to provide greater biodiversity. Necessary materials are 15 concrete risers - \$15,000; 2 screw gates - \$2,000; and erosion control seed mix - \$3,000. The prices for these materials represent the most reasonable available in our area based upon our experience and currently available suppliers. We will follow our organization's guidelines to procure materials from the most cost effective sources possible.

- Seed stock for the planting will be from local bottomland hardwoods, endemic to the region at the rate of 1 per foot. A list of species and approximate percentages follows:

Are costs pro-rated and how do you know that costs are reasonable? What other information justifies the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget?

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL budget and how did you determine the costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

EXAMPLE

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Biologists to construct side levees and distribution channel	2 for 6 mo	\$30,000/yr	\$30,000	Jan-June, 2002	1, 2
1 engineer to manage engineering and construction work	1 for 3 mo	\$36,000/yr	\$9,000	April-June, 2002	Jones
Engineer's travel to sites	10 trips from office in Minneapolis, MN	\$400/trip	\$4,000	April-June, 2003	Jones
Technicians to prepare sites by removing fences, clearing debris, etc	2 for 3 months	\$24,000/yr	\$12,000	Sept – Nov, 2003	Jones
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$39,000	NA	NA

How do you know costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the NON-CONTRACTS PERSONNEL budget?

EXAMPLES

- The salaries and travel costs represent market value for services provided in the region based upon our experience, inflation rates and the type of work we will accomplish.
- We have determined by reviewing salaries and benefits for engineers in 3 other companies that this is market value for this service in this area.

Will restoration of any tracts be credited to wetlands mitigation banks or be used to satisfy wetlands mitigation requirements?

Are there any other restoration costs shown in the Budget Table that are not described above?

ENHANCEMENT BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – \$5,000 and 10 acres
Grant - \$0 Match - \$5,000 Non-Match - \$0

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the CONTRACTS budget and how did you determine costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
		\$/	\$		
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$	NA	NA

How do you know the costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the CONTRACTS budget?

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget, what will be purchased, and how did you determine costs? For plantings of seeds or seedlings are to be planted, what seed or plant species will be planted and what percentage of each species is in the total planting? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

EXAMPLE

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Wood duck houses	10	\$500/house	\$5,000	June, 2002	1
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$5,000	NA	NA

Are costs pro-rated and how do you know that costs are reasonable? What other information justifies the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget?

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL budget and how did you determine the costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
		\$/	\$		
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$	NA	NA

How do you know costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL budget?

Will enhancement of any tracts be credited to wetlands mitigation banks or be used to satisfy wetlands mitigation requirements?

Are there any other enhancement costs shown in the Budget Table that are not described above?

CREATED WETLANDS BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – \$10,000 and 1,000 acres
Grant - \$0 Match - \$10,000 Non-Match - \$0

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the CONTRACTS budget and how did you determine costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
		\$/	\$		
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$	NA	NA

How do you know costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the CONTRACTS budget?

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget, what will be purchased, and how did you determine costs? For plantings of seeds or seedlings are to be planted, what seed or plant species will be planted and what percentage of each species is in the total planting? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
	1	\$/	\$		
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$	NA	NA

Are costs pro-rated and how do you know that costs are reasonable? What other information justifies the MATERIALS and EQUIPMENT budget?

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL budget and how did you determine the costs? If some tracts are not yet identified, explain why and the method to be used to select tracts during proposal implementation.

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
		\$/	\$		
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$	NA	NA

How do you know costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the NON-CONTRACT PERSONNEL budget?

OTHER DIRECT COSTS BUDGET JUSTIFICATION – \$25,000
Grant - \$ Match - \$25,000 Non-Match - \$0

What work will be done, when and on what tract(s) through the OTHER DIRECT COSTS budget and how did you determine the costs?

EXAMPLE

Item and Work	Units	\$/unit	Total \$	Schedule (month, year)	Tract
Biologist to manage the NAWCA grant (i.e., the Project Officer)	Half time for 2 years	\$30,000/yr	\$30,000	NA	NA
TOTAL COSTS	NA	NA	\$30,000	NA	NA

How do you know costs are reasonable and what other information justifies the OTHER DIRECT COSTS budget?

INDIRECT COSTS BUDGET JUSTIFICATION - \$52,500
Grant \$50,000 Match \$2,500 Non-match \$0

Did you attach your current approved negotiated indirect cost rate agreement signed by your cognizant agency to the proposal or ascertain that the Council Coordinator has a copy of your current agreement? For more on indirect costs, go to [2003 Eligibility Criteria & Processes \(http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf\)](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003EligibilityCriteria&Processes.pdf), Grant Costs I, second paragraph. Change made 2/7/03.

What is the direct cost base upon which you calculated indirect costs? To calculate indirect costs for the proposal, multiply eligible direct costs from the budget table by your negotiated indirect cost rate.

EXAMPLE

Match or Grant	Direct Cost Activities	Direct Costs	Approved Indirect Cost Rate	Indirect Costs
Match	Appraisals	\$25,000	10%	\$2,500
Match Subtotal				\$2,500
Grant	Restoration – Materials	\$500,000	10%	\$50,000
Grant Subtotal				\$50,000
TOTALS		\$525,000	10%	\$52,500

2003 PROPOSAL TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

The [North American Wetlands Conservation Act \(http://law2.house.gov/usc.htm\)](http://law2.house.gov/usc.htm) specifies criteria to be used to evaluate proposals. The criteria are displayed through the following 7 Technical Assessment Questions (Questions).

Question 1 - How does the proposal contribute to the conservation of waterfowl habitat?

Question 2 - How does the proposal contribute to the conservation of other wetland-associated migratory birds?

Question 3 - How does the proposal benefit the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and contribute to sites that have been recognized for wetland values?

Question 4 - How does the proposal relate to the national status and trends of wetlands types?

Question 5 - How does the proposal contribute to long-term conservation of wetlands and associated habitats?

Question 6 - How does the proposal contribute to the conservation of habitat for federally listed, proposed, and candidate endangered species; state-listed species; and other wetland-dependent fish and wildlife?

Question 7 - How does the proposal satisfy the partnership purpose of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act?

Answer the Questions as follows:

- Provide separate answers for each question. Remember that the questions, including species lists, are available in the [2003 Word Proposal Outline \(http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc\)](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc) and [2003 Word Perfect Proposal Outline \(http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd\)](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd) files. Proposals without answers to the Questions will be returned.
- Answers should cover benefits derived from completed grant- and match-funded work in the proposal that occurred within the past 2 years and will occur during the two-year Assistance Award period.
- Do NOT include information/benefits/acres associated with non-match work or tracts except in Questions 7C and 7D.
- Be as qualitative and as quantitative as possible.
- Select the best methods to provide as much information as possible (such as giving species, abundance and seasonal use information in a table followed by a narrative), while adhering to format and proposal length guidelines.
- Specifically explain linkages between the proposal tracts and conservation objectives (national and regional) of the following programs and plans: North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Partners in Flight, U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan, and North American Waterbird Conservation Plan.
- Do NOT include benefits to a larger affected area, such as previous or future phases of the current proposal area.
- Include all habitat types (not just wetlands).

9. Make sure acreage figures are consistent with those given elsewhere in the proposal.
10. Include only benefits from actions covered by the proposal. For example, if the proposal includes acquisition of sites that need restoration and restoration is not part of the proposal, do not include restored habitat values in answers to the Questions. Note that unless restoration is also included in the proposal, proposals for acquisition of degraded wetlands will be evaluated on the basis of the degraded condition and subsequent resource benefits.
11. If a Matching Contributions Plan is submitted with the proposal, include that acreage and those benefits in your answers. However, if a Matching Contributions Plan was previously approved, do NOT include the associated acreage and benefits in your answers.
12. Reviewers assign points based on information in the proposal. In addition, reviewers evaluate the Questions and the proposal in relation to the group of proposals under review. This is a scoring factor that you can neither control nor predict. Scores are available about 8 weeks after the proposal due dates.
13. Review the file [2003 Grant Administration Policies and Assistance Award \(http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grant.pdf\)](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/grant.pdf) to see how Technical Assessment Question answers will be incorporated into the Assistance Award/Grant Agreement.

2003 SCORING TABLE

CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS	POINTS = 100
#1. WATERFOWL A. High priority species B. Other priority species C. Other waterfowl	MAXIMUM = 15 0-7 0-5 0-3
#2. WETLAND-ASSOCIATED MIGRATORY BIRDS A. Bird Conservation Regions and high priority birds B. Other wetland-associated birds	MAXIMUM = 15
#3. NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SPECIALLY RECOGNIZED SITES A. Joint Ventures and Areas of Concern Prairie Pothole Joint Venture, Other Joint Ventures, Areas of Concern, Combination B. Specially recognized sites	MAXIMUM = 15 0-10, 0-8, 0-4, 0-? 0-5
#4. WETLANDS STATUS AND TRENDS A. Decreasing wetlands types B. Stable wetlands types C. Increasing wetlands types D. No trend data types E. Uplands	MAXIMUM = 10 0-10 0-4 0-1 0-? 0-8
#5. LONG-TERM CONSERVATION A. Benefits in perpetuity B. Benefits for 26-99 years C. Benefits for 10-25 years D. Benefits for <10 years E. Significance to long-term conservation	MAXIMUM = 15 0-12 0-8 0-6 0-4 0-3
#6. ENDANGERED SPECIES AND OTHER WETLAND-DEPENDENT FISH AND WILDLIFE A. Federal endangered, threatened, proposed or candidate species = 1, 2, >2 species B. State-listed species = ≥1 species C. Other wetland-dependent fish and wildlife = ≥1 species	MAXIMUM = 10 0-3, 0-4, 0-5 0-3 0-2
#7. PARTNERSHIPS A. Ratio of non-Federal match to grant request = ≤ 1:1, 1.01-1.49:1, 1.5-1.99:1, ≥ 2:1 B. Matching partners contributing 10% of the grant request = 0-1, 2, 3, >3 C. Partner categories = 1, 2, 3, >3 D. Important partnership aspects	MAXIMUM = 20 0, 1, 3, 6 0, 1, 2, 3 0, 2, 3, 4 0-7

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #1 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL CONTRIBUTE TO THE CONSERVATION OF WATERFOWL HABITAT?

Under A, B, and C below, list species that will be impacted by the grant and match work (do NOT include non-match) and succinctly

provide the additional requested information to explain how the proposal will impact the species.

A. HIGH PRIORITY SPECIES Tule Greater White-fronted Goose, Dusky Canada Goose, Cackling Canada Goose, Southern James Bay Canada Goose, Northern Pintail, Mottled Duck, American Black Duck, Mallard, Lesser Scaup, Greater Scaup

How proposal will aid in meeting objectives of waterfowl conservation plans:

How many individuals/pairs will use the proposal area and for what life cycle stage and whether this is an improvement in population numbers over the current situation:

How proposal will impact species and improve habitat quality (describe before- and after-proposal environment):

Importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts shown in the proposal to the species (if tracts are not yet identified, explain what procedure will be used to ensure that high quality habitat is targeted):

B. OTHER PRIORITY SPECIES Pacific Greater White-fronted Goose, Wrangel Island Snow Goose, Atlantic Brant, Pacific Brant, Wood Duck, Redhead, Canvasback, Ring-necked Duck, Common Eider, American Wigeon

How proposal will aid in meeting objectives of waterfowl conservation plans:

How many individuals/pairs will use the proposal area and for what life cycle stage and whether this is an improvement in population numbers over the current situation:

How proposal will impact species and improve habitat quality (describe before- and after-proposal environment):

Importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts in the proposal to the species groups (if tracts are not yet identified, explain what procedure will be used to ensure that high quality habitat is targeted):

C. OTHER WATERFOWL

Species and Narrative:

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #2 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL CONTRIBUTE TO THE CONSERVATION OF OTHER WETLAND-ASSOCIATED MIGRATORY BIRDS?

A. BIRD CONSERVATION REGIONS AND PRIORITY BIRDS

List the Bird Conservation Region (BCR) number, title, and priority NAWCA species corresponding to this proposal. Do NOT include benefits from non-match work. This question focuses on non-waterfowl species. Find BCR numbers and titles on the [BCR map](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NABCI/images/fwsmap.pdf) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NABCI/images/fwsmap.pdf>). Find the priority NAWCA species in BCR's listed below and in the [2003 Word Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordProposalOutline.doc>) and [2003 Word Perfect Proposal Outline](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/2003WordPerfectProposalOutline.wpd>) files. Copy and paste applicable BCR's and species lists here.

Narrative: Succinctly describe the impact of the grant and match work in the proposal (do not include non-match) on each NAWCA priority species or group of species (explain basis for grouping), being sure to include

- **How the proposed activities will aid in meeting habitat conservation objectives of migratory bird conservation plans** (e.g. how much priority habitat will be conserved?). To access these plans or contact plan coordinators, click below:
[Partners In Flight](http://www.blm.gov/wildlife/pifplans.htm) (songbirds) (<http://www.blm.gov/wildlife/pifplans.htm>) (terry_rich@fws.gov)
[US Shorebird Conservation Plan](http://www.manomet.org/USSCP/files.htm) (<http://www.manomet.org/USSCP/files.htm>) (brad_Andres@fws.gov)
[North American Waterbird Conservation Plan](http://www.nawcp.org) (<http://www.nawcp.org>) (Jennifer_Wheeler@fws.gov)
[North American Waterfowl Management Plan](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov>): click on Bird Conservation Plans, North American Waterfowl Management Plan, and 1998 Plan Update) or seth_mott@fws.gov or [Joint Venture plans](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/links.htm) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/links.htm>).

EXAMPLES

This project meets the goal of two 6-10,000 acre forested patches of bottomland forests in the Flint River basin identified in the PIF Bird Conservation Plan for the South Atlantic Coastal Plain. Independently, Swainson Swamp meets the goal of 10,000-acre patches for prothonotary and Swainson's warblers and 20,000-acre patches for yellow-throated warblers.

The U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan, Lower Mississippi/West Gulf Coast has a goal of ensuring that shorebirds using this planning region are not limited by foraging habitat, especially during southward migration. Objectives include: (1) increase fall shorebird habitat on private lands by 25%. Hence, restoration of estuarine wetlands (29,237 acres) in the proposal will provide foraging habitat essential for these birds during fall migration when management plans call for summer drawdowns or when these wetlands dry naturally in late summer, thereby contributing directly to Objective 1 above.

- **Whether the project area will be used as breeding, migrating, and/or wintering habitat, and**
- **Importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts in the proposal to the species/species groups.** If tracts are not yet identified, explain what procedure will be used to ensure that high quality habitat is targeted.

B. OTHER WETLAND-ASSOCIATED BIRDS

Species:

Narrative: Succinctly describe the impact of the proposal on each species or group of species (please explain basis for grouping) by explaining how the proposal will aid in meeting objectives of migratory bird conservation plans (see A above), whether the proposal area will be used as breeding, migrating, and/or wintering habit, and importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts shown on maps in the proposal to the species/species groups.

2003 BIRD CONSERVATION REGIONS AND QUESTION 2 PRIORITY NAWCA SPECIES

BCR 1 ALEUTIAN/BERING SEA ISLANDS	BCR 2 WESTERN ALASKA	BCR 3 ARCTIC PLAINS AND MOUNTAINS
Red-faced Cormorant Black-bellied Plover Black Oystercatcher Rock Sandpiper Red-legged Kittiwake Aleutian Tern Kittlitz's Murrelet Ancient Murrelet Whiskered Auklet	Red-throated Loon Yellow-billed Loon Red-faced Cormorant Sandhill Crane Black-bellied Plover Pacific Golden-Plover American Golden-Plover Whimbrel Bristle-thighed Curlew Hudsonian Godwit Bar-tailed Godwit Marbled Godwit Red Knot Rock Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher Arctic Tern Aleutian Tern Marbled Murrelet Kittlitz's Murrelet Ancient Murrelet Short-eared Owl Blackpoll Warbler Rusty Blackbird	Yellow-billed Loon American Golden-Plover Whimbrel Bar-tailed Godwit Dunlin Buff-breasted Sandpiper Snowy Owl Short-eared Owl Smith's Longspur
BCR 4 NORTHWESTERN INTERIOR FOREST	BCR 5 NORTHERN PACIFIC RAINFOREST	BCR 9 GREAT BASIN
American Golden-Plover Whimbrel Hudsonian Godwit Rock Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher Short-eared Owl Hammond's Flycatcher Blackpoll Warbler Smith's Longspur	Yellow-billed Loon Ashy Storm-Petrel Black Storm-Petrel Least Storm-Petrel Brandt's Cormorant Red-faced Cormorant Northern Harrier Sandhill Crane Black-bellied Plover Black Oystercatcher Whimbrel	American White Pelican White-faced Ibis Northern Harrier Yellow Rail Sandhill Crane Black-bellied Plover American Golden-Plover Snowy Plover American Avocet Solitary Sandpiper Whimbrel

	Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Black Turnstone Surfbird Red Knot Rock Sandpiper Dunlin Short-billed Dowitcher Arctic Tern Aleutian Tern Kittlitz's Murrelet Cassin's Auklet Short-eared Owl Rufous Hummingbird Allen's Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Red-breasted Sapsucker Olive-sided Flycatcher Willow Flycatcher Pacific-slope Flycatcher Northern Rough-winged Swallow Marsh Wren Black-throated Gray Warbler Bullock's Oriole Tricolored Blackbird	Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Sanderling Wilson's Phalarope Yellow-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Black Swift Black-chinned Hummingbird Calliope Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Willow Flycatcher Marsh Wren MacGillivray's Warbler Tricolored Blackbird
BCR 10 NORTHERN ROCKIES	BCR 11 PRAIRIE POTHOLE	BCR 12 BOREAL HARDWOOD TRANSITION
Swainson's Hawk Yellow Rail Sandhill Crane American Golden-Plover Snowy Plover American Avocet Whimbrel Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Sanderling Wilson's Phalarope Short-eared Owl Black Swift Vaux's Swift Calliope Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Red-naped Sapsucker Hammond's Flycatcher Northern Rough-winged Swallow American Dipper MacGillivray's Warbler Bobolink	American Bittern Northern Harrier Swainson's Hawk Yellow Rail Sandhill Crane American Golden-Plover Piping Plover Solitary Sandpiper Willet Long-billed Curlew Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Sanderling White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Wilson's Phalarope Black-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Grasshopper Sparrow Henslow's Sparrow Le Conte's Sparrow Nelson's Sharp-tailed Sparrow	American Bittern Northern Harrier Yellow Rail King Rail Whimbrel Marbled Godwit Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher Wilson's Phalarope American Woodcock Common Tern Black Tern Yellow-bellied Flycatcher Sedge Wren Marsh Wren Golden-winged Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Connecticut Warbler Canada Warbler Henslow's Sparrow Le Conte's Sparrow
BCR 13 LOWER GREAT LAKES/ST. LAWRENCE PLAIN	BCR 14 ATLANTIC NORTHERN FORESTS	BCR 15 SIERRA NEVADA
American Bittern Least Bittern Northern Harrier Virginia Rail Lesser Yellowlegs Whimbrel Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Semipalmated Sandpiper Pectoral Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Common Snipe American Woodcock Common Tern Black Tern	Yellow Rail Whimbrel Willet Hudsonian Godwit Red Knot Purple Sandpiper American Woodcock Common Tern Razorbill Olive-sided Flycatcher Sedge Wren Canada Warbler Nelson's Sharp-tailed Sparrow	Long-billed Curlew Black Swift Calliope Hummingbird Rufous Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Olive-sided Flycatcher Western Wood-Pewee Warbling Vireo Yellow-billed Magpie Marsh Wren American Dipper Nashville Warbler MacGillivray's Warbler Black-headed Grosbeak Tricolored Blackbird

Red-headed Woodpecker Sedge Wren Golden-winged Warbler Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Louisiana Waterthrush Canada Warbler Henslow's Sparrow Bobolink		
BCR 16 SOUTHERN ROCKIES/COLORADO PLATEAU	BCR 17 BADLANDS AND PRAIRIES	BCR 18 SHORTGRASS PRAIRIE
American White Pelican White-faced Ibis Northern Harrier Swainson's Hawk Snowy Plover Solitary Sandpiper Marbled Godwit Wilson's Phalarope Black Tern Yellow-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Black Swift Calliope Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Red-naped Sapsucker Western Wood-Pewee Willow Flycatcher Bell's Vireo Marsh Wren American Dipper Veery Wilson's Warbler Lazuli Bunting Yellow-headed Blackbird	American Golden-Plover Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Sanderling Wilson's Phalarope Black-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Calliope Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Red-naped Sapsucker Grasshopper Sparrow Le Conte's Sparrow Lazuli Bunting	Western Grebe American White Pelican Northern Harrier Mississippi Kite Sandhill Crane American Golden-Plover Snowy Plover American Avocet Solitary Sandpiper Long-billed Curlew White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Forster's Tern Lewis's Woodpecker Red-headed Woodpecker Bell's Vireo Marsh Wren Painted Bunting Yellow-headed Blackbird
BCR 19 CENTRAL MIXED GRASS PRAIRIE	BCR 20 EDWARDS PLATEAU	BCR 21 OAKS AND PRAIRIES
American White Pelican American Bittern Little Blue Heron Mississippi Kite Northern Harrier Black Rail Sandhill Crane American Golden-Plover Snowy Plover American Avocet Solitary Sandpiper Long-billed Curlew Hudsonian Godwit Stilt Sandpiper White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Wilson's Phalarope American Woodcock Forster's Tern Short-eared Owl Bell's Vireo Marsh Wren LeConte's Sparrow Painted Bunting	Northern Harrier Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Yellow-billed Cuckoo Vermillion Flycatcher Bell's Vireo Yellow-throated Vireo Sedge Wren Prothonotary Warbler Kentucky Warbler LeConte's Sparrow Painted Bunting Orchard Oriole	Little Blue Heron White Ibis Northern Harrier American Golden-Plover American Avocet Long-billed Curlew Hudsonian Godwit Stilt Sandpiper White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Red-headed Woodpecker Bell's Vireo Sedge Wren Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Kentucky Warbler Henslow's Sparrow LeContes Sparrow Painted Bunting Rusty Blackbird
BCR 22 EASTERN TALLGRASS PRAIRIE	BCR 23 PRAIRIE HARDWOOD TRANSITION	BCR 24 CENTRAL HARDWOODS
American Bittern Mississippi Kite Northern Harrier	American Bittern Northern Harrier Black Rail	King Rail Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper

Black Rail King Rail Common Moorhen Sandhill Crane Greater Yellowlegs Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Stilt Sandpiper White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher American Woodcock Wilson's Phalarope Common Tern Forster's Tern Black-billed Cuckoo Acadian Flycatcher Willow Flycatcher Sedge Wren Marsh Wren Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Louisiana Waterthrush Grasshopper Sparrow Henslow's Sparrow LeConte's Sparrow Rusty Blackbird	King Rail Common Moorhen Greater Yellowlegs Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Stilt Sandpiper White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher American Woodcock Wilson's Phalarope Black Tern Common Tern Forster's Tern Black-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Acadian Flycatcher Willow Flycatcher Sedge Wren Marsh Wren Golden-winged Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Cerulean Warbler Henslow's Sparrow	American Woodcock Short-eared Owl Red-headed Woodpecker Acadian Flycatcher Bell's Vireo Sedge Wren Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Louisiana Waterthrush LeConte's Sparrow Rusty Blackbird
BCR 25 WEST GULF COASTAL PLAIN/ OUACHITAS	BCR 26 MISSISSIPPI ALLUVIAL VALLEY	BCR 27 SOUTHEASTERN COASTAL PLAIN
Little Blue Heron White Ibis Swallow-tailed Kite Northern Harrier American Golden-Plover Hudsonian Godwit Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Short-eared Owl Red-headed Woodpecker Acadian Flycatcher Bell's Vireo Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Louisiana Waterthrush Henslow's Sparrow LeConte's Sparrow Orchard Oriole	American White Pelican Little Blue Heron Swallow-tailed Kite Mississippi Kite Yellow Rail Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Piping Plover Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Short-eared Owl Red-headed Woodpecker Bell's Vireo Sedge Wren Wood Thrush Northern Parula Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Henslow's Sparrow LeConte's Sparrow Rusty Blackbird Orchard Oriole	Little Blue Heron Reddish Egret Swallow-tailed Kite Yellow Rail Black Rail Limpkin Sandhill Crane Snowy Plover Wilson's Plover Piping Plover American Oystercatcher Whimbrel Marbled Godwit Red Knot Semipalmated Sandpiper Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher American Woodcock Gull-billed Tern Royal Tern Common Tern Black Tern Black Skimmer Wood Thrush Northern Parula Black-throated Green Warbler Prairie Warbler Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Henslow's Sparrow LeConte's Sparrow Saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrow Nelson's Sharp-tailed Sparrow Seaside Sparrow
BCR 28 APPALACHIAN MOUNTAINS	BCR 29 PIEDMONT	BCR 30 NEW ENGLAND/MID-ATLANTIC COAST

Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Short-eared Owl Acadian Flycatcher Sedge Wren Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Louisiana Waterthrush	Black Rail American Woodcock Red-headed Woodpecker Acadian Flycatcher Sedge Wren Cerulean Warbler Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Henslow's Sparrow Rusty Blackbird	Black Rail Wilson's Plover American Oystercatcher Whimbrel Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Red Knot Purple Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper American Woodcock Common Tern Least Tern Black Skimmer Razorbill Short-eared Owl Sedge Wren Marsh Wren Cerulean Warbler Henslow's Sparrow Saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrow Seaside Sparrow
BCR 31 PENINSULAR FLORIDA	BCR 32 COASTAL CALIFORNIA	BCR 33 SONORAN AND MOJAVE DESERTS
American Bittern Little Blue Heron Reddish Egret White Ibis Swallow-tailed Kite Yellow Rail Black Rail Limpkin Sandhill Crane Snowy Plover Wilson's Plover Piping Plover American Oystercatcher Whimbrel Marbled Godwit Red Knot Semipalmated Sandpiper Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher American Woodcock Gull-billed Tern Common Tern Least Tern Black Skimmer White-crowned Pigeon Mangrove Cuckoo Black-whiskered Vireo Prairie Warbler Henslow's Sparrow Saltmarsh Sharp-tailed Sparrow Nelson's Sharp-tailed Sparrow Seaside Sparrow	Northern Harrier Cooper's Hawk Black Rail Sandhill Crane Black-bellied Plover Black Oystercatcher American Avocet Willet Whimbrel Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Black Turnstone Red Knot Short-billed Dowitcher Gull-billed Tern Elegant Tern Black Skimmer Cassin's Auklet Short-eared Owl Black Swift Black-chinned Hummingbird Allen's Hummingbird Lewis's Woodpecker Olive-sided Flycatcher Western Wood-Pewee Yellow-billed Magpie Violet-green Swallow Marsh Wren Warbling Vireo Black-headed Grosbeak Lazuli Bunting Tricolored Blackbird Bullock's Oriole Hooded Oriole	Northern Harrier Common Black-Hawk Black Rail Snowy Plover Black-necked Stilt American Avocet Long-billed Curlew Marbled Godwit Wilson's Phalarope Black Skimmer Yellow-billed Cuckoo Short-eared Owl Elf Owl Gila Woodpecker Northern Beardless-Tyrannulet Bell's Vireo Yellow Warbler Lucy's Warbler Abert's Towhee Hooded Oriole Yellow-headed Blackbird Tricolored Blackbird
BCR 34 SIERRA MADRE OCCIDENTAL	BCR 35 CHIHUAHUA DESERT	BCR 36 TAMAULIPAN BRUSHLANDS
Northern Harrier Cooper's Hawk Gray Hawk Common Black-Hawk Sandhill Crane Yellow-billed Cuckoo Western Screech-Owl Elf Owl	Northern Harrier Common Black-Hawk Zone-tailed Hawk Sandhill Crane Snowy Plover Long-billed Curlew Wilson's Phalarope Yellow-billed Cuckoo	Northern Harrier Black Rail Sandhill Crane Snowy Plover American Avocet Long-billed Curlew Stilt Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper

Short-eared Owl Broad-billed Hummingbird Blue-throated Hummingbird Black-chinned Hummingbird Elegant Trogon Northern Beardless-Tyrannulet Cordilleran Flycatcher Sulphur-bellied Flycatcher Thick-billed Kingbird Bell's Vireo Purple Martin Lucy's Warbler Yellow Warbler Red-faced Warbler Painted Redstart Abert's Towhee Black-headed Grosbeak Varied Bunting Hooded Oriole	Elf Owl Black-chinned Hummingbird Red-naped Sapsucker Bell's Vireo Marsh Wren Lucy's Warbler Yellow Warbler Abert's Towhee Varied Bunting Painted Bunting Yellow-headed Blackbird Hooded Oriole	American Woodcock Gull-billed Tern Elf Owl Northern Beardless-Tyrannulet Rose-throated Becard Bell's Vireo Painted Bunting Altamira Oriole LeConte's Sparrow
BCR 37 GULF COAST PRAIRIE	BCR 67 HAWAII	PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS
American Bittern Tricolored Heron Reddish Egret White Ibis Swallow-tailed Kite Northern Harrier Yellow Rail Black Rail Sandhill Crane American Golden-Plover Snowy Plover Wilson's Plover Piping Plover American Oystercatcher Whimbrel Long-billed Curlew Hudsonian Godwit Marbled Godwit Red Knot Stilt Sandpiper White-rumped Sandpiper Buff-breasted Sandpiper Short-billed Dowitcher American Woodcock Gull-billed Tern Least Tern Black Tern Black Skimmer Red-headed Woodpecker Acadian Flycatcher Sedge Wren Tropical Parula Prothonotary Warbler Swainson's Warbler Henslow's Sparrow LeConte's Sparrow Seaside Sharp-tailed Sparrow Nelson's Sharp-tailed Sparrow Seaside Sparrow	Band-rumped Storm-Petrel Brown Booby Christmas Shearwater Newell's Shearwater Dark-rumped Petrel Tristram's Storm-petrel White-tailed Tropicbird Great Frigatebird Masked Booby Red-footed Booby Pacific Golden-Plover Bristle-thighed Curlew Wandering Tattler	West Indian Whistling-Duck White-cheeked Pintail Masked Duck Ruddy Duck Black Rail Yellow-breasted Crake Caribbean Coot Limpkin Snowy Plover Wilson's Plover American Oystercatcher Semipalmated Sandpiper Stilt Sandpiper Least Tern White-crowned Pigeon Short-eared Owl Black Swift Lesser Antillean Pewee Bicknell's Thrush Yellow Warbler (resident <i>cruciana</i> ssp. only) Northern Waterthrush Louisiana Waterthrush

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #3 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL BENEFIT THE NORTH AMERICAN WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT PLAN AND CONTRIBUTE TO SITES THAT HAVE BEEN RECOGNIZED FOR WETLAND VALUES?

To access the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, Joint Venture Plans and Joint Venture Coordinators, click below:

- [North American Waterfowl Management Plan](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov>): click on Bird Conservation Plans, North American Waterfowl Management Plan, and 1998 Plan Update) or seth_mott@fws.gov
- [North American Waterfowl Management Plan Joint Venture Coordinators](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWMP/jvdir.htm) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWMP/jvdir.htm>) and [Joint Venture Plans](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/links.htm) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/links.htm>)

A. JOINT VENTURES AND AREAS OF CONCERN Use the [map](http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/namap.gif) (<http://birdhabitat.fws.gov/NAWCA/images/namap.gif>) to determine which Joint Venture (JV) or Area of Concern (Area) the grant and match tracts are in (do NOT include non-match tracts). List the JV, Area, or combination of JV and Area the proposal is in. If the proposal is a combination, provide acreage of each.

Joint Ventures = Atlantic Coast, Central Valley Habitat, Gulf Coast, Intermountain West, Lower Mississippi Valley, Pacific Coast, Playa Lakes, Prairie Pothole, Rainwater Basin, San Francisco Bay, Upper Mississippi River/Great Lakes

U.S. Waterfowl Habitat Areas of Concern = Several in Alaska, Northern Great Plains (MT, ND, SD), and Sandhills (NE)

Describe how the proposal will aid in meeting objectives of the NAWMP, the Joint Venture, the Area of Concern, and any other NAWMP planning unit (e.g., State or Focus Area):

B. SPECIALLY RECOGNIZED SITES State whether the whole proposal area or a specific tract in the proposal (do NOT include non-match tracts) has been recognized by any program/agency for wetlands and/or migratory bird values. Some programs that recognize special wetlands and migratory bird sites are listed below, however, consider any international, State, regional or local program/agency when answering.

- Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network
- Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (RAMSAR)
- U.S. Department of State Man in the Biosphere Reserve
- U.S. Bureau of Land Management Area of Critical Environmental Concern
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency National Estuary Program
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (National Wildlife Refuge System and Regional Wetlands Concept Plan under the National Wetlands Priority Conservation Plan)
- U.S. National Ocean Service (National Estuarine Research Reserve and National Marine Sanctuary)
- U.S. National Park Service National Natural Landmark
- U.S. Federal Agency Research Natural Area
- State Wildlife Management Area or State Natural Area

Explain how the actions in the proposal contribute to maintenance of the wetlands and/or migratory bird values for which the site was recognized:

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #4 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL RELATE TO THE NATIONAL STATUS AND TRENDS OF WETLANDS TYPES?

For more information about wetlands functions, maps, the classification system/types/codes used below, and national and regional status and trends, go to the [National Wetlands Inventory \(NWI\) web site](http://wetlands.fws.gov/) (<http://wetlands.fws.gov/>). Contact regional coordinators for state or regional information. All wetland types are not listed below, but they are given in the Cowardin report on the NWI web site.

Narrative:

- For any types listed as Stable or Increasing below, explain the importance to wetland-associated migratory birds.
- If a wetland type (including subsidiary types not listed below) in the proposal has a different regional or local status than shown below, give the type, give evidence (citation, references, etc.) to justify the status, and explain the importance of the type to wetland-associated migratory birds.
- List types of uplands (e.g., cropland, grassland, forest) and describe the relationship of the uplands to wetlands and migratory bird conservation (i.e., reason for including in proposal).

Table: By activity and individual or logical groupings of match and grant tracts give the acreage of each wetland type or group of types. Do NOT include non-match tracts. Do NOT include duplicated/non-add acres that are indicated with parentheses in your Proposal Summary. Non-add acres, benefits from non-add acres, and work on non-add acres should be reported in all sections of the proposal EXCEPT Technical Assessment Question 4. If your proposal is funded, you will be required to submit reports that compare actual accomplishments with the acreage figures and habitat types you give here.

EXAMPLE

ACTIVITY and TRACTS/GROUPS OF TRACTS IN THE PROPOSAL (grant and match tracts only)	STATUS, TYPES and ACRES OF WETLANDS Note: Types subsidiary to types listed below have the same status.								UPLANDS	TOTAL	
	DECREASING			STABLE			INCREASING	NO TREND DATA			
	PEM	PFO	E2Veg	E2AB, E2US	L	R	M2, PAB, PUB/POW, PSS, PUS	E1, PML, PRB			
Fee Acquired	300								1,200	1,500	
Fee Donated	1,000									1,500	
Easement Acquired		750								750	
Easement Donated						250				250	
Lease Acquired											
Lease Donated											
ACQUIRED	1,300	750				250				3,500	
RESTORED	600								100	700	
ENHANCED		200								200	
CREATED											
OTHER											
TYPE TOTALS	1,900	950				250			1,300	4,400	
STATUS TOTALS	2,750			250						1,300	4,400
GRAND TOTALS	3,000								1,400	4,400	
Tract: A	300								1,200	1,500	
Tract B	1,000									1,000	
Tract C		750								750	
Tract D						250				250	
Tract E	600								100	700	
Tract F		200								200	

E1=estuarine subtidal, **E2AB**=estuarine intertidal aquatic bed, **E2US**=estuarine intertidal unconsolidated shore, **E2Veg**=estuarine intertidal vegetated (E2EM, intertidal emergent marsh, and E2SS, estuarine intertidal scrub-shrub), **L**=lacustrine, **M2**=marine intertidal, **PAB**=palustrine aquatic bed, **PEM**=palustrine emergent, **PFO**=palustrine forested, **PML**=palustrine moss-lichen, **PRB**=palustrine rock bottom, **PSS**=palustrine scrub-shrub, **PUB/POW**=palustrine unconsolidated bottom/palustrine open water, **PUS**=palustrine unconsolidated shore, **R**=riverine

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #5 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL CONTRIBUTE TO LONG-TERM CONSERVATION OF WETLANDS AND ASSOCIATED HABITATS?

Table: Describe the completed proposal area (grant and match tracts) in a table (such as the one below) by showing acres according to activity and tenure of activity or structures. Do NOT include non-match tracts. Include duplicated acres indicated with parentheses in the Proposal Summary. All possible activities are shown in the example, but if your proposal does not contain a certain activity, such as Lease Acquired, do not include that line. Note that if your proposal is funded, you will be required to submit reports that compare actual accomplishments with the acreage figures you give here.

EXAMPLE

ACTIVITY	ACRES BY TENURE (years) OF BENEFITS CATEGORY				TOTAL ACRES
	* Includes water control structures made of material other than wood.				
	** Includes wood water control structures and pumps.				
	PERPETUITY	*26-99	**10-25	< 10	
Fee Acquired	1,500				1,500
Fee Donated	1,000				1,000
Easement Acquired	750				750
Easement Donated					250
Lease Acquired					
Lease Donated					
ACQUIRED	3,500				3,500
RESTORED		700 (1,000)			700 (1,000)

ACTIVITY	ACRES BY TENURE (years) OF BENEFITS CATEGORY				TOTAL ACRES
	* Includes water control structures made of material other than wood.				
	** Includes wood water control structures and pumps.				
	PERPETUITY	*26-99	**10-25	< 10	
ENHANCED				200	200
CREATED					
OTHER					
TOTAL	3,500	700 (1,000)		200	4,400 (1,000)
Tract A	1,500				1,500
Tract B	1,000	(600)			1,000 (600)
Tract C	750	(400)			750 (400)
Tract D	250				250
Tract E		700			700
Tract F				200	200

Narrative: Provide narrative needed to explain the table information. Also answer the following questions.

- How significant is the proposed work on each tract and the cumulative work in the completed proposal to long-term wetlands conservation in terms of 1) how work on each tract complements work on other tracts; 2) threats to wetlands values (address acquisition of water rights, if applicable); 3) conservation or management of larger wetland areas; and 4) objectives of wetlands conservation plans.
- What is your justification for modifying existing wetlands from one type to another?
- Specifically for proposed restoration and enhancement activities, how long will the results last and when will maintenance or additional work be needed? How reliable and successful are any proposed vegetation control techniques?
- What is the long-term conservation and management plan for the proposal area? What are your plans to sell any tracts in the proposal?
- How will the easement restrictions and reserved rights serve to ensure long-term wetland conservation and health?

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #6 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL CONTRIBUTE TO THE CONSERVATION OF HABITAT FOR FEDERALLY LISTED, PROPOSED, AND CANDIDATE ENDANGERED SPECIES; STATE-LISTED SPECIES; AND OTHER WETLAND-DEPENDENT FISH AND WILDLIFE?

For more information on federal species and critical habitat go to the [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Program's web site \(http://endangered.fws.gov/\)](http://endangered.fws.gov/). Click on Species Information for species-specific information. Go to the [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species Program's contacts page \(http://endangered.fws.gov/contacts\)](http://endangered.fws.gov/contacts) for information in a regional or state context. Under A, B, and C below, list species that will be impacted by the grant and match work (do NOT include non-match tracts) and succinctly provide the additional requested information to explain how the proposal will impact the species.

A. FEDERALLY THREATENED, ENDANGERED, PROPOSED OR CATEGORY 1 CANDIDATE SPECIES

Species:

How many individuals/pairs will use the proposal area and for what life cycle stage and whether this is an improvement in population numbers over the current situation:

How proposal will improve habitat quality (describe the before- and after-proposal environment):

Whether proposed actions and proposal area are identified in a recovery plan or other species plan:

Whether the completed proposal will contribute towards relieving the need for any special protective status for the species:

Importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts in the proposal to the species (if tracts are not yet identified, explain what procedure will be used to ensure that high quality habitat is targeted):

Additional information:

B. STATE-LISTED ENDANGERED OR THREATENED SPECIES

Species: Do NOT list species listed in A.

How many individuals/pairs will use the proposal area and for what life cycle stage and whether this is an improvement in population numbers over the current situation:

How proposal will improve habitat quality (describe the before- and after-proposal environment):

Whether proposed actions and proposal area are identified in a recovery plan or other species plan:

Whether the completed proposal will contribute toward relieving the need for any special protective status for the species:

Importance of each tract or logical groupings of tracts in the proposal to the species (if tracts are not yet identified, explain what procedure will be used to ensure that high quality habitat is targeted):

Additional information:

C. OTHER WETLAND-DEPENDENT FISH AND WILDLIFE

Species and narrative:

2003 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT QUESTION #7 - HOW DOES THE PROPOSAL SATISFY THE PARTNERSHIP PURPOSE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT?

A. RATIO State the ratio of the non-Federal match to the grant request (e.g., the ratio of a non-Federal match of \$1,500,000 to a \$1,000,000 grant request = 1.5:1). A 2:1 match or higher gains maximum points. To receive credit, signed Partner Contribution Statements from matching partners must be submitted with the proposal.

B. 10% MATCHING PARTNERS List the matching partners who contribute at least 10% of the grant request (e.g., for a \$1,000,000 grant request, list the matching partners who contribute at least \$100,000). To receive credit, signed matching Partner Contribution Statements (or letters in 2003) must be submitted with the proposal.

C. PARTNER CATEGORIES Show the partner diversity by listing each partner (irrespective of contribution amount) under one of the following categories. To receive credit, signed Partner Contribution Statements (or letters in 2003) from matching and non-matching partners must be submitted with the proposal.

- State agencies;
- Non-governmental conservation organizations (e.g., local wildlife club, Ducks Unlimited, Inc., The Nature Conservancy);
- Local governments, counties or municipalities (e.g., Conservation District);
- Private landowners;
- Profit-making corporations (e.g., Exxon);
- Native American governments or associations;
- Federal agencies; and
- Other partner groups.

D. IMPORTANT PARTNERSHIP ASPECTS Describe other important partnership aspects of the proposal (e.g., new grant recipient, significant new partners, unique partners, large number of partners under any category in C. above, and non-financial contributions). For each non-matching partner listed in the Proposal Summary, explain why they are important to the proposal and what work they will do to support and complement the match- and grant-funded work. To receive credit, signed Partner Contribution Statements (or letters in 2003) from matching and non-matching partners must be submitted with the proposal.

2003 PROPOSAL ATTACHMENTS

Have you attached the following?

Budget Table. You may insert the table as an unnumbered page in the budget section of the proposal or as an attachment.

Tract Table. For each tract provide the information shown in the example below. A table is not required, but is preferred. Make sure tracts that are part of a Matching Contributions Plan (previously approved or submitted with the proposal) are noted here and in the Proposal Summary. See example.

EXAMPLE

TRACT and ACRES	TOWNSHIP	RANGE	SECTION	COUNTY	STATE	JOINT VENTURE	FINAL TITLE HOLDER
Tract A 40 acres	T36N	R112W	SE ¼, NW ¼, Section 10	Phelps	MN	Prairie Pothole	State DNR
* ¹ Tract B 500 acres	T36N	R112W	SE ¼, NW ¼, Section 11	Phelps	MN	Prairie Pothole	Easement = DU Fee = Smith
* ² Tract (2,000) acres	T36N	R112W	SE ¼, NW ¼, Section 13	Cameron	MN	None	State DNR
Totals = 3 tracts, 2,000 (2,000) acres							

*¹ Acreage is part of the Matching Contributions Plan submitted for approval with this proposal.

*² Acreage is part of the Matching Contributions Plan approved on 9/13/00. It is shown in () to avoid double counting, since the acreage was accounted for in the first proposal.

Partner Contribution Statements. The Partner Contribution Statement (Statement) replaces partner letters. However, letters may be still be submitted this year if they contain the required information.

- Each matching (including the grantee and private landowners if providing funds and/or donating title to property) and non-matching partner (including Federal partners) listed in the proposal must complete a Statement.
- Each Statement must be submitted with the proposal before on the deadline date.
- The Statements must be signed and dated for the contribution to be considered documented.
- It is preferred that each partner listed in the proposal complete a Statement. If this cannot be done, another party may vouch for the matching partner, but no credit will be gained in the Partnership Technical Assessment Question 7 under the categories of "10% partners" and "partner categories". These situations will be handled on a case-by-case basis.
- If you want to display support from non-funding sources, do not send Statements or letters, but instead include a statement in the proposal such as "To illustrate the overwhelming support for this proposal, we have 37 letters on file from landowners and State and Federal representatives. Let us know if you would like to see copies of these letters."
- Please do not make the grantee's Statement a cover or transmittal sheet for the proposal.
- If the North American Wetlands Conservation Council through a Matching Contributions Plan has approved any match through a Matching Contributions Plan, include a copy of that approval letter in this section.
- Remember that the contribution amount on the Statement must be the same as the amount shown in the proposal for the partner. If the amount differs in any section of the proposal or on the Statement, the lesser of the two will be considered the partner's contribution. If there are many such inconsistencies in the proposal, it will be returned as ineligible.

EXAMPLE

**NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION ACT PROPOSAL
PARTNER CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT**

What is the title of the proposal that you are contributing to? St. George's Marsh II, state.

When will you make the contribution? See below.

What is the value of your contribution and how did you determine the value? Does the contribution have a non-federal origin? If this is based on a fund-raising event or other future action, if that future action fails, will you still provide the contribution amount? Our contribution is \$200,000. The non-federal sources are shown below and are not dependent on fund-raising or other events. Also see below for an explanation of how the values were determined.

\$165,000 covers

1. \$15,000 from State migratory bird habitat stamp sales that is to be pooled with grant funds to conduct appraisals on 26 tracts to be acquired in fee and easement through this proposal and
2. \$150,000 (same source) used to purchase a perpetual conservation easement on 158 acres (Tracts 16) last year within the Priority 1 acquisition area. The habitat type in these tracts is palustrine emergent wetlands (potholes) and adjacent grasslands used for nesting by ducks and other migratory birds. The ratio of wetlands to grasslands is 3:1 as required for successful waterfowl production in this area.

Copies of model and actual easements are attached to the proposal to further document these contributions.

\$30,000 is fair market value for restoration work (including acquisition and installation of a \$5,000 pump) last year. Approximately 100 acres (Tracts B-F) covering five pothole wetlands and associated uplands were converted from cropland to palustrine emergent wetlands and native grass pasture. The source was State appropriations.

\$5,000 is to cover part of the Project Officer's time in administering the grant, such as ensuring that work is completed on schedule, facilitating legal and technical aspects of the proposal and processing invoices and reports required by the NAWCA office. Time spent on this work will be documented and able to be verified from our records, should an audit be necessary. The source is State appropriations.

Additionally, our negotiated indirect cost rate agreement is attached to the proposal to support our request for indirect costs from grant funds. This documents that our rate is current and approved by our cognizant agency and documents that the NAWCA proposal budget items we used to calculate indirect costs in the proposal are consistent with, and contained in, our indirect cost rate agreement base.

What long-term migratory bird and wetlands conservation work will the contribution cover? See above.

Does the proposal correctly describe your contribution, especially the amount? Yes.

If applicable to the proposal, is your organization competent to hold title to, and manage, land acquired with grant funds and are you willing to apply a Notice of Grant Agreement or other recordable document to the property? We will hold title to and manage property acquired with grant funds and are competent to do so. The state has a diverse network of Wildlife Management Areas and State Preserves. We are committed to long-term conservation of wetlands and associated habitats for the wildlife dependent thereon. We are willing to apply a Notice of Grant Agreement or other recordable document to the property.

Do you have any additional comments? We have been a long-standing partner in the planning and implementation of the St. George's Marsh plan. We are pleased to be a part of the St. George's Marsh project that will aid in meeting objectives of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and Minnesota Partners in Flight plans, as explained in the proposal. We put this match forward to leverage and complement other non-Federal, as well as Federal grant, dollars to meet objectives of NAWCA. This letter is less than one year old and signed at the highest fiscal level in our organization.

Signature:

Your Name (printed), Organization, and Title:

Date Signed:

Optional Matching Contributions Plan. A Match Plan may be submitted with a proposal when you have matching funds in addition to what you will use for this proposal and need to maintain the eligibility of this match beyond two years for future proposals. Council will consider waiving the two-year eligibility rule based on the circumstances by which the additional match was obtained, your need, and how the match will be utilized. You will be notified in writing if your Match Plan is rejected or approved. Other sections of these instructions contain information on how to apply the Match Plan dollars, acres, and natural resource benefits in future proposals.

- **What is the Match Plan Amount and Purpose?** State the amount of match that you need to keep eligible for future proposals (*use this same amount in the lower right-hand cell of the chart below) and briefly describe the conservation goals to be achieved by future proposals supported by this match.
- **What is the Match Plan Intent?** Describe how/why the additional match was obtained, including the sources (partners) and the relationship of these partners to the proposal.
- **What is the Match Plan Need?** Describe why this match, that will be over two years old, is necessary to complete future phases of the proposal as opposed to obtaining new match for these proposals.
- **Is there a Match Plan Chart?** Provide a chart showing Match Plan partner contributions used in the current proposal and future proposals. See the example below.

EXAMPLE

MATCH PLAN PARTNERS	CURRENT PROPOSAL	PROPOSAL II	PROPOSAL III	TOTAL \$
Match Plan Partner 1	\$500,000	\$300,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
Match Plan Partner 2	\$200,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$ 500,000
Matching Contributions Plan Totals		\$450,000	\$350,000	\$ 800,000*

Standard Form 424 "Application for Federal Assistance" and **"Assurances B – Non-construction program" and/or "D – construction program"**. All applicants, EXCEPT the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, must send a SF 424 and either B, D or both

Assurances forms with the proposal. If you are uncertain whether B or D is applicable, complete and submit both. All Federal grant recipients must comply with the laws listed on the Assurances forms. You can access the forms through the [U.S. General Service Administration's web site](http://www.gsa.gov/forms/) (<http://www.gsa.gov/forms/>) or through the [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of Federal Aid's web site](http://training.fws.gov/fedaids/toolkit/toolkit.pdf) (<http://training.fws.gov/fedaids/toolkit/toolkit.pdf>; go to "forms"). Instructions for completing the SF 424 to accompany a NAWCA proposal follow and supersede those on the back of the SF 424.

CELL NUMBER and TITLE	INSTRUCTIONS
1 – Type of Submission	Check "Construction", "Non-Construction" or both boxes.
2 – Date Submitted	Enter date proposal submitted to Council Coordinator.
3 – Date Received by State	Leave blank.
4 – Date Received by Federal agency	Leave blank.
5 – Applicant Information, 6 – Employer Identification, 7 – Type of Applicant	See instructions on back of SF 424.
8 – Type of Application	Enter only "New".
9 – Name of Federal Agency	Enter "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service"
10 – Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number and Title	Enter "15-623" and "No. American Wetlands Conservation Fund"
11 – Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:	Enter title used in Part 1 of the proposal.
12 – Areas Affected by Project	Enter only information for "Counties and States".
13 – Proposed Project Start Date/End Date	Leave blank.
14 – Congressional Districts of Applicant/Project	Enter only information for "b. Project".
15 – Estimated Funding	Do not include non-match \$. In "a", only include NAWCA grant \$. In "b-e", only include matching partner \$. Leave "f" blank.
16 – Is Application Subject to Review by State EO 12372 Process?	Only applicable to states.
17 – Is Applicant Delinquent on any Federal Debt?	See instructions on back of SF 424.
18 – a. – e.	Enter information for proposal Project Officer.

Optional aerial photographs. One or two aerial photographs (copied onto 8 ½ by 11 inch paper) may be submitted, but are not required. Do not send other types of photographs.

Maps. As the last attachment, provide one to two maps that show the following. Additionally, you may also provide a very limited number of maps that provide tract details. Please be prudent and limit the number of maps. Color maps are preferred. Several copies of the proposal, including maps, will be made, so it is critical that maps reproduce well in color. More than one map may be included on a page.

- Proposal title
- Location of the WHOLE proposal area (all grant, match, and non-match tracts) within State(s) and counties
- Identification and location of all fee-title, easement and lease tracts (or acquisition priority areas if tracts have not been identified)
- Identification and location of all restoration and enhancement tracts, major water control structures and other major restoration/enhancement features
- A legend, if needed
- Map scale
- A north directional arrow
- Location of natural features (rivers, lakes) to show how the proposal fits into the natural landscape
- Location of previous grant and future proposal sites
- If applicable and possible, where the proposal is in relation to a larger wetlands conservation project (show larger project boundary and boundary of current proposal).

2003 PROPOSAL EASEMENT, LEASES, AND INDIRECT COST RATE AGREEMENT

Have you included the following?

Copies of easements and leases in place when the proposal was submitted and models for easements and leases to be acquired through the proposal.

If applicable, a copy of your **current approved negotiated indirect cost rate agreement** signed by your cognizant agency. If you are requesting grant funds for indirect costs or using indirect costs as match, attach either 1) a statement that you have

ascertained that the Council Coordinator has a copy of your current agreement on file or 2) a copy of your most current approved indirect cost rate agreement.

12/18/02
revised 1/23/03 and 2/7/03